

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/706,078	11/03/2000	David Forrest Squires	XXT-064	6149

7590 08/26/2004

PATRICK R. ROCHE
FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN MINNICH & McKEE LLP
1100 SUPERIOR AVENUE
7TH FLOOR
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-2518

EXAMINER

MAURO JR, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/706,078

Applicant(s)

SQUIRES ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas J. Mauro Jr.

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,6-9,11 and 14-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,6-9,11 and 14-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 May 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20040702
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2143

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11 and 14-21 remain pending. Claims 2, 4-5, 10 and 12-13 have been cancelled. In addition, claims 22-31 have been added.
2. Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11 and 14-31 are presented for further examination. A formal action on the merits of claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11 and 14-31 follows.
3. Objections made against the specification and drawings have been withdrawn receiving the proper corrections.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 22 and 28 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of

Art Unit: 2143

compending Application No. 09/706430. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both recite a similar method for allocating print processing jobs to different devices in a print shop environment.

Claim 1 of the instant application recites a system having (1) a plurality of cells comprising a plurality of devices for accomplishing a document processing job, (2) a module that determines workflow for a job, (3) splitting a job into sub-jobs, (4) assigning said sub-jobs to a cell and further (5) splitting a sub-job into lots for processing.

Similarly, claims 16-22 of co-pending application 09/706430 recite (1) dividing resources into cells which have the necessary resources to accomplish a job, (2) determining what tasks need to be performed to complete the given print job, i.e. workflow module, (4) assigning each print job to one or more cells for processing and further (5) splitting the job into lots for processing.

While splitting of jobs into sub-jobs for processing is not explicitly taught, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate splitting a job into sub-jobs in order to provide faster total completion of jobs which require different devices residing on a different cell(s) for completion.

Similarly claims 3, 6, 9, 22 and 28 recite limitations found within the co-pending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hansen (U.S. 6,509,974).

With respect to claim 17, Hansen teaches a method for assigning sub-jobs to available cells in a printing workflow system for coordinating document processing jobs, wherein each of the available cells is comprised of at least one device for printing a product-type, the method comprising:

identifying maximum capacity of each of the available cells to print the product type [Hansen -- Col. 7 lines 36-37, Col. 11 lines 26-30 and Col. 18 lines 46-51 –

Capabilities, including capacity of devices, i.e. queues, are known by the workflow management software because it monitors the queues of the various printers to determine if a queue is too big, i.e. maximum capacity by comparing the current capacity to the maximum or full capacity];

identifying current loading of each of the available cells to print a product type [Hansen -- Col. 18 lines 46-51 – **In order for allocator to determine queue is too**

Art Unit: 2143

large, i.e. too many jobs exist for that device, current loading information would be required to be known by the allocator];

determining based on the maximum capacity and current loading of each of the available cells a current capacity of each of the available cells to print the product-type **[Hansen -- Col. 18 lines 35-43 – Allocator knows capabilities, i.e. capacity of devices, and the current loading or job queue information, therefore, allocator would inherently know available capacity of the devices];** and

assigning at least one of the available cells for printing the product type based on the current capacity of each of the available cells **[Hansen -- Col. 18 lines 29-32 and lines 35-43 – Allocator knows capabilities, i.e. capacity of devices, and the current loading or job queue information, upon which, allocator chooses how to distribute or best produce a given page and assigns job to that resource. The print server diverts, i.e. assigns, the particular job to a given printer or resource].**

With respect to claim 18, Hansen further teaches wherein the print workflow system stores the maximum capacities of each of the available cells in the print workflow system **[Hansen -- Col. 11 lines 26-30 and Col. 18 line 48 – Capabilities, including capacity of devices, i.e. queues, are known by the workflow management software, which would require these values be stored in memory].**

With respect to claim 19, Hansen further teaches a pull-type control policy for determining whether a cell can be assigned new document processing jobs **[Hansen -- Col. 7 lines 4-5 and lines 36-37 – Load balancing policies serve to maximize production of output devices by keeping all printers fully utilized].**

Art Unit: 2143

With respect to claim 20, Hansen further teaches wherein the print workflow system updates the current loading of each available cells [**Hansen -- Col. 11 lines 26-30 and Col. 18 line 48 – Because allocator knows amount of jobs in queue, this would require that as jobs are allocated, the capacity of the queues be updated**].

With respect to claim 21, Hansen further teaches wherein the print workflow system updates the maximum capacity [**Hansen -- Col. 11 lines 26-30 and Col. 17 lines 43-46 – In order for system to manage workflow properly, capacities and capabilities would be required to be updated as new capabilities become available or as time changes current capacities/capabilities on the devices, i.e. as more jobs are assigned to one device, queue becomes too large and exceeds maximum capacity**].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 22, 24-26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smirnov et al. (U.S. 6,546,366) in view of Mima et al. (US 2002/0101604).

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 1, Smirnov teaches a printing workflow system disposed in a network environment for coordinating production of document processing jobs, said printing workflow system comprising:

a plurality of autonomous cells, wherein each cell is comprised of a plurality of devices and resources at least some devices and resources performing distinct operations from one another, and that are capable of accomplishing at least one type of document processing job [Smirnov -- **Figure 2, Col. 3 line 67 – Col. 4 lines 1-10 and Col. 7 lines 29-67 – Col. 8 lines 1-25 – Plurality of cells, performing independent printing processes, are responsible for completing the book publishing workflow, namely one cell containing a number of different printers, i.e. cover, body, color and black/white printers, and RIPing resources and another cell containing the binding equipment and cutting equipment. These cells contain some different devices for performing different operations for a different type of document processing job, i.e. printing and binding/cutting (finishing jobs)**]; and

a workflow mapping module that determines workflow for a selected one of said document processing jobs [Smirnov -- **Figures 5 and 6 and Col. 10 lines 22-54 – Scheduler accesses model to produce workflows in response to the various tasks needed to complete an order**];

Smirnov fails to explicitly teach splitting selected document processing jobs into sub-jobs to be accomplished by ones of the autonomous cells, assigning said sub-jobs to said given cells, and receiving the sub-jobs and further splitting said job into lots for processing.

Mima, however, discloses a printing system which breaks up a job to print a document into sub-jobs of color printing and black/white printing and assigns them to the

Art Unit: 2143

appropriate printer [Mima -- Page 5 paragraphs [0053] and [0055] – Document is received and broke up into the color pages and the black/white pages. Since one color printer, color page(s) is/are sent to that printer. Black/white pages go to black/white printers of which there are two for printing]. In addition, the sub-job, i.e. black/white printing, is further broken up into two lots to be printed by two separate black/white printers in order to speed up the printing process for faster printing [Mima -- Page 5 paragraphs [0055-0060] – Because job is scheduled for fast printing, black/white sub-job is further broken up into lots to be processed by two online black/white printers for faster processing].

Both Smirnov and Mima are concerned with processing documents based upon device capability and a sub-job workflow.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the splitting selected document processing jobs into sub-jobs to be accomplished by ones of the autonomous cells, assigning said sub-jobs to said given cells, and receiving the sub-jobs and further splitting said job into lots for processing, as taught by Mima into the invention of Smirnov, in order to provide a system which provides for the optimal use of printers and printing resources and further gives rise to greater production and greater use of resources [Mima -- Page 1 paragraph [0008]].

Regarding claim 22, Smirnov-Mima teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including wherein there is no dependence among said cells and their corresponding devices in that each cell operates autonomously relative

Art Unit: 2143

to the other cells [Smirnov -- **Figure 2, Col. 3 line 67 – Col. 4 lines 1-10 and Col. 7 lines 29-67 – Col. 8 lines 1-25 – Plurality of cells, performing independent printing processes, are responsible for completing the book publishing workflow, namely one cell containing a number of different printers, i.e. cover, body, color and black/white printers, and RIPing resources and another cell containing the binding equipment and cutting equipment. Because these cells are independent, printing cell works independently from the binding/cutting or finishing cell**].

Regarding claim 3, Smirnov-Mima teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 22 above, including a storage device for holding information regarding capacities and capabilities of said cells [Mima -- **Figure 5 and page 4 paragraphs [0046-0047] – Table management module is a table storing printer information including capacities, i.e. number of pages per minute printer will handle, and capabilities, i.e. color or black/white**] and for storing information regarding workflow of each document processing job said workflow comprising a sequence of operations needed to be performed to accomplish the selected document processing job [Mima -- **Figure 7 and page 5 paragraphs [0052-0055] – Print control data, i.e. specifications for the print request regarding color, speed, quality, etc., are received and are obviously stored in memory for review by the document monitor to choose the proper printer for the job**].

Regarding claim 6, Smirnov-Mima teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 3 above, including wherein said product cell controller splits

Art Unit: 2143

said sub-jobs into optimal lot sizes determined by analyzing said workflow of said selected document processing job, wherein said sub-job is split into smaller lots for optimal utilization of said cell devices such that as one said cell device processes one said lot another said cell device processes another said lot simultaneously **[Mima -- Page 5 paragraphs [0055-0060] – Sub-jobs, i.e. black/white job and color, are further broken up into lots. Based upon the specifications for the print request, jobs black/white sub-job is further broken down to achieve the desired printing speed by having separate black/white printer print a certain number of pages to meet print speed requested].**

Regarding claim 9, Smirnov teaches a method used in a print workflow system disposed in a network environment for coordinating production of document processing jobs, said method comprising:

partitioning document processing devices and resources into a plurality of autonomous cells capable of accomplishing at least one type of document processing job **[Smirnov -- Figure 2, Col. 3 line 67 – Col. 4 lines 1-10 and Col. 7 lines 29-67 – Col. 8 lines 1-25 – Plurality of cells, performing independent printing processes, are responsible for completing the book publishing workflow, namely one cell containing a number of different printers, i.e. cover, body, color and black/white printers, and RIPing resources and another cell containing the binding equipment and cutting equipment. These cells contain some different devices for performing different operations for a different type of document processing job, i.e. printing and binding/cutting (finishing jobs)]; and**

Art Unit: 2143

determining workflow for a selected one of said document processing job

[Smirnov -- Figures 5 and 6 and Col. 10 lines 22-54 – Scheduler accesses model to produce workflows in response to the various tasks needed to complete an order].

Smirnov fails to explicitly teach splitting selected document processing jobs into sub-jobs to be accomplished by ones of the autonomous cells; assigning said sub-jobs to said given ones of the autonomous cells capable of accomplishing entire said sub-job and receiving the sub-jobs and further splitting said job into lots for processing.

Mima, however, discloses a printing system which breaks up a job to print a document into sub-jobs of color printing and black/white printing and assigns them to the appropriate printer **[Mima -- Page 5 paragraphs [0053] and [0055] – Document is**

received and broke up into the color pages and the black/white pages. Since one color printer, color page(s) is/are sent to that printer. Black/white pages go to black/white printers of which there are two for printing]. In addition, the sub-job, i.e. black/white printing, is further broken up into two lots to be printed by two separate black/white printers in order to speed up the printing process for faster printing **[Mima -- Page 5 paragraphs [0055-0060] – Because job is scheduled for fast printing, black/white sub-job is further broken up into lots to be processed by two online black/white printers for faster processing].**

Both Smirnov and Mima are concerned with processing documents based upon device capability and a sub-job workflow.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the splitting selected document processing jobs into sub-jobs to be accomplished by ones of the autonomous cells, assigning said sub-jobs to

Art Unit: 2143

said given cells, and receiving the sub-jobs and further splitting said job into lots for processing, as taught by Mima into the invention of Smirnov, in order to provide a system which provides for the optimal use of printers and printing resources and further gives rise to greater production and greater use of resources [**Mima -- Page 1 paragraph [0008]]**].

Regarding claim 24, Smirnov-Mima teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 22 above, including wherein ones of said autonomous cells include at least one said device not included in other ones of said autonomous cells [**Smirnov -- Figure 2, Col. 3 line 67 – Col. 4 lines 1-10 and Col. 7 lines 29-67 – Col. 8 lines 1-25 – Plurality of cells, performing independent printing processes, are responsible for completing the book publishing workflow, namely one cell containing a number of different printers, i.e. cover, body, color and black/white printers, and RIPing resources and another cell containing the binding equipment and cutting equipment. These cells contain some different devices for performing different operations for a different type of document processing job, i.e. printing and binding/cutting (finishing jobs)]**].

Regarding claim 25, Smirnov-Mima teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 3 above, including wherein the workflow module [**Smirnov - - Figures 5 and 6 and Col. 10 lines 22-54 – Scheduler accesses model to produce workflows in response to the various tasks needed to complete an order]** uses said information to determine a workflow for a selected document processing job [**Mima --**

Art Unit: 2143

Page 4 paragraphs [0046-0047] – Information regarding printing capabilities is stored to use to decide which printer(s) to send jobs to based upon job specifications] and the job decomposition module uses said workflow to split said document processing job into autonomous sub-jobs **[Mima -- Page 5 paragraphs [0053] and [0055] – Document is received and broke up into the color pages and the black/white pages based upon the specified parameters of the print request. Since one color printer, color page(s) is/are sent to that printer. Black/white pages go to black/white printers of which there are two for printing].**

Regarding claim 26, Smirnov-Mima teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 25 above including wherein the cell assignment module uses said workflow to assign said autonomous sub-jobs to given ones of said autonomous cells capable of accomplishing entire said sub-job **[Mima -- Page 5 paragraphs [0053] and [0055] – Document is received and broke up into the color pages and the black/white pages based upon the specified parameters of the print request. Since one color printer, color page(s) is/are sent to that printer. Black/white pages go to black/white printers of which there are two for printing. Thus, based upon the desired tasks to be completed, assignment of a sub-job to a cell is based upon what needs to be done, i.e. printing must go to the printing cell, and binding must go to the cell containing the finishing equipment, i.e. binder and cutter, etc.].**

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 28, this is a method claim similar to the system claimed in claim 22 above. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 28 is rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 7-8, 11, 14-16, 27 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smirnov et al. (U.S. 6,546,3664) and Mima et al. (US 2002/0101604), as applied to claim 6 above, in view of Chi (U.S. 5,751,580).

Regarding claim 7, Smirnov-Mima teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 6 above, but fails to explicitly the use of kanbans as workflow control elements.

Chi, however, teaches a control system for computer control of workflow in an automatic process containing a plurality of workstations which employs the use of a kanban token system for controlling workflow processes by giving each job or sub-job a number of tokens which are then freed up upon completion and sent back upstream to be given to the next job [**Chi -- Col. 1 lines 42-64 and Col. 3 lines 2-8**].

Smirnov-Mima and Chi all are concerned with workflow processing of jobs in an automatic process environment.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of kanbans as workflow control elements, as taught by Chi into the invention of Smirnov-Mima, in order to manage the dispatching of

Art Unit: 2143

jobs and to maintain a balanced flow or work as well as maximum equipment utilization

[Chi -- Col. 1 lines 32-33 and lines 61-64].

Regarding claim 8, Smirnov-Mima-Chi teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 7 above, including wherein said cell devices send authorization to upstream devices to supply said cell devices with next said lot **[Chi -- Col. 1 lines 47-57 – Once lot is completed by device, device releases, i.e. frees, token and it is sent back upstream to accept another lot from the kanban].**

Regarding claim 11, Smirnov-Mima-Chi teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 27, including holding information regarding capacities and capabilities of said cells **[Mima -- Figure 5 and page 4 paragraphs [0046-0047] – Table management module is a table storing printer information including capacities, i.e. number of pages per minute printer will handle, and capabilities, i.e. color or black/white]** and for storing information regarding workflow of each document processing job, said workflow being comprised of a sequence of operations needed to be performed to accomplish the selected document processing job **[Mima -- Figure 7 and page 5 paragraphs [0052-0055] – Print control data, i.e. specifications for the print request regarding color, speed, quality, etc., are received and are obviously stored in memory for review by the document monitor to choose the proper printer for the job].**

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 14, Smirnov-Mima-Chi teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 11 above, including splitting said sub-job into optimal lot sizes determined by analyzing said workflow of said selected document processing job, whereby said sub-job is split into smaller lots for optimal utilization of said cell devices **[Mima -- Page 5 paragraphs [0055-0060] – Sub-jobs, i.e. black/white job and color, are further broken up into lots. Based upon the specifications for the print request, jobs black/white sub-job is further broken down to achieve the desired printing speed by having separate black/white printer print a certain number of pages to meet print speed requested].**

Regarding claim 15, Smirnov-Mima-Chi teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 14 above, including wherein said receiving step assigns a number of kanbans to said lots as workflow control elements **[Chi -- Col. 1 lines 42-64 and Col. 3 lines 2-8 – Kanban tokens are assigned to lots to manage workflow and job execution].**

Regarding claim 16, Smirnov-Mima-Chi teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 15 above, including wherein said receiving step further comprises sending authorization from cell devices to upstream devices to supply said selected cell devices with next said lot **[Chi -- Col. 1 lines 47-57 – Once lot is completed by device, device releases, i.e. frees, token and it is sent back upstream to accept another lot from the kanban].**

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 27, Smirnov-Mima-Chi teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 8 above, including wherein said assigned kanbans are released as said lots are processed and said assigned kanbans become available for future authorization of said lots **[Chi -- Col. 1 lines 42-64 -- Upon completion of processing of a lot, the token from the kanban is freed and is sent upstream for assignment to another lot for processing]**.

Regarding claim 29, this is a system claim similar to the system claimed in claim 25 above. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 29 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 30, Smirnov-Mima-Chi teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 29 above, including wherein the cell step of assigning uses said workflow to assign said autonomous sub-jobs to given ones of said autonomous cells capable of accomplishing entire said sub-job **[Mima -- Page 5 paragraphs [0053] and [0055] -- Document is received and broke up into the color pages and the black/white pages based upon the specified parameters of the print request. Since one color printer, color page(s) is/are sent to that printer. Black/white pages go to black/white printers of which there are two for printing. All of this is based upon the capabilities of the cell devices and the print specification received]**.

Regarding claim 31, Smirnov-Mima-Chi teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 16 above further comprising releasing said assigned

Art Unit: 2143

kanbans as said lots are processed, whereby said assigned kanbans become available for future authorization of said lots **[Chi -- Col. 1 lines 42-64 – Upon completion of processing of a lot, the token from the kanban is freed and is sent upstream for assignment to another lot for processing].**

11. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smirnov et al. (U.S. 6,546,3664) and Mima et al. (US 2002/0101604), as applied to claim 22 above, in view of Tomory (U.S. 5,815,764).

Regarding claim 23, Smirnov-Mima teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 22 above, however do not explicitly teach the grouping of devices into cells as specified, namely a first cell containing a printer and a binder and a second cell containing a copier and a collator.

Smirnov, however, does teach the devices of a printer and a binder **[Smirnov -- Figure 2 and Col. 4 lines 1-17, Col. 7 lines 51-55 and Col. 7 lines 65-67 – Col. 8 lines 1-6 – Both printer and binders are used independently within the system to accomplish jobs].**

In addition, Tomory teaches a job routing system for a printing system which employs the use of such well-known and common publishing devices such as copiers and collators **[Tomory -- Col. 2 lines 3-9 and lines 18-28, Col. 6 lines 58-62 and Col. 10 lines 14-17].**

Art Unit: 2143

While neither Smirnov-Mima nor Tomory explicitly teach the arrangement of the cells as indicated in the claim, it would have been obvious to arrange the devices into cells in any order necessary in order to provide a variety of printing services. No unexpected results are obtained by grouping them in any particular order, thus it would have been obvious to arrange the devices into cell groups which include a printer and a binder and a copier and a collator in order to provide a printing system which separates devices based upon function such as printing and finishing and document duplication which allows for an efficient system that produces the publishers desired results.

Furthermore, it has been upheld in *In re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950), that the mere rearrangement of parts does not in itself distinguish over the prior art when no unexpected results are obtained.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6-9 and 14-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2143

- Owa et al. (U.S. 6,348,971) discloses a printer selection device within a printing system for choosing the proper printer based upon document specifications.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mauro Jr. whose telephone number is 703-605-1234. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TJM

August 9, 2004



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100